

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in the application; with claims 1, 10, 14 and 20 being the only independent claims. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. US 2003/0016770 (Trans) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,831 (Melas) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,451 (Betts).

The Examiner has allowed claims 10-22 (paragraph 4 of the Office Action actually states claims "10-21", which is an obvious typographical error as claim 22 depends from allowable claim 20). Further, the Examiner has objected to claims 2-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **II. Office Action Response**

Claims 2, 3 and 4 each previously depended directly from claim 1. Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 1 into each of these claims and cancelled claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 4 are allowable over the prior art. Each of the remaining previously objected to claims (e.g., claims 5-9) depend from either claim 3 or claim 4 and are therefore also allowable over the prior art.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes claims 2-22 to be patentable and the application to be in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests issuance

of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

**Yhean-Sen Lai**

By:



Thomas J. Onka, Reg. No. 42,053

Date: 11/10/05

Synnestvedt Lechner & Woodbridge LLP  
P.O. Box 592  
Princeton, NJ 08542  
609-924-3773 phone  
609-924-1811 fax